# Comparative Analysis of Feminism-Related Ideologies among Students in Single-Sex and Coeducational Institutions

Diksha Bijlani
Divya Utreja

The International Journal of
**INDIAN PSYCHOLOGY**

**Comparative Analysis of Feminism-Related Ideologies among Students in Single-Sex and Coeducational Institutions**

Diksha Bijlani

*University of Delhi - Gargi College (South Campus)*

*Siri Fort Road, New Delhi, India*


Divya Utreja

*University of Delhi - Gargi College (South Campus)*

*Siri Fort Road, New Delhi, India*

# THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INDIAN PSYCHOLOGY

-- -- -- -- -- -- -- --

-- -- -- -- -- -- -- --

Please submit your work's abstract or introduction to ( info.ijip@gmail.com | www.ijip.in)

**Publishing fees, ₹ 500 OR $ 15 USD only (online and print both)**

**Dr. Varghese Paul K**
*Head, P.G. Dept. of Psychology, Prajyoti Niketan*
*College, Pudukad,*
*Aided & Affiliated to University of Calicut, Kerala,*
*INDIA*
**Vishal Parmar**
*Forensic Psychology, Institute of Behavioural*
*Science, Gujarat Forensic Sciences University,*
*Gandhinagar, Gujarat.*
*INDIA*

**Ajay Chauhan**
*Clinical Psychology, Sardar Patel University,*
*Vallabh Vidyanagar*
*INDIA*

# Message from the Desk of Editor

This gives me an immense pleasure to announce that 'RED'SHINE Publication, Inc' is coming out with its third volume of peer reviewed, international journal named as 'The International Journal of Indian Psychology. IJIP Journal of Studies'is a humble effort to come out with an affordable option of a low cost publication journal and high quality of publication services, at no profit no loss basis, with the objective of helping young, genius, scholars and seasoned academicians to show their psychological research works to the world at large and also to fulfill their academic aspirations.

The International Journal of Indian Psychology welcomes submissions that explore the social, educational and psychological aspects of human behavior as related to human. Because The International Journal of Indian Psychology takes a broad and inclusive view of the study of both psychology and social science, this publication outlet is suitable for a wide variety of interests. Appropriate submissions could include general survey research, attitudinal measures, research in which criminal justice practitioners are participants, investigations into broad societal issues, or any number of empirical approaches that fit within the general umbrella provided by the journal.

At last, our thanks go out to the members of the journal who have done their best to work at this collaborative effort. May you continue in this wonderful spirit, which, we are sure will sustain your efforts in the future towards enhancing and enriching this journal.

**Prof. Suresh Makvana, PhD**[1]
(Editor in Chief)

---

[1] ksmnortol@gmail.com

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Diksha Bijlani is a student of Applied Psychology honours at Gargi College, University of Delhi. Her first tryst with psychology beginning only at the start of her undergraduate education, she has pursued the interest vigorously ever since. Her inclinations lie in quantitative research types, with selective interest in thematic analysis. She aims to read Masters in Public Policy with a specialization in Indian Administration, and get into the field of public service and social entrepreneurship. Her non-academic interests lie in spoken word poetry and journalism.

Divya Utreja is a student of Applied Psychology at Gargi College, University of Delhi. She is an enthusiastic observer and a budding researcher in her field. She is also passionate about her work. Although currently in her bachelor's programme, she has started contributing towards enriching the literature and this issue/book comprises her first contribution. She aspires to be a clinical psychologist.

## ABSTRACT

The aim of the study was to dichotomously study the differences in feminism perspectives, support for feminism, and feminist self-identification between students in single-sex and students in co-educational higher learning institutions, with special emphasis on students with chronic single-sex/coed schooling and students with discontinuous single-sex/coed schooling. For this, a web-based survey questionnaire was administered on a sample of 100 undergraduates and graduates (age group 18-23) studying in higher learning institutions all over India. The survey questionnaire included three feminism scales: the liberal, radical, socialist and women of color/womanist subscales of Feminist Perspectives Scale (Henley, et. al., 1998) to study perspectives on feminism, the 11-item short form of the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS) by Morgan (1996) to study support for feminism, and a closed-ended question "To what extent do you consider yourself a feminist?" from Morgan (1996) to measure feminist self-identification. The findings revealed that: 1)Female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger support for feminism, stronger positions on radical perspective of feminism, and higher feminist self-identification than students in coed higher learning institutions, 2)Students in chronic and discontinuous single-sex schooling show stronger support for feminism than students with chronic coed schooling, 3)Students in chronic single-sex schooling have higher feminist self-identification than students in discontinuous co-ed. The study has implications for future research on correlates of feminist ideologies in college students as well as in framing public policies on education with respect to single-sex and co-ed institutions.

**Keywords:** *Feminism, Feminist Self-Identification, Close-Ended, Chronic, Discontinuous, Survey, Ideology*

<span style="background-color:black;color:white">**INTRODUCTION**</span>

**Feminism**

Feminism as used in this paper combines the following two definitions: 1) in its narrowest sense, feminism is a complex set of political ideologies used by the women's movement to advance the cause of women's equality and put an end to sexist theory and the practice of social oppression; and 2) in a broader and deeper sense, feminism is defined as a variety of interrelated frameworks used to observe, analyze, and interpret the complex ways in which the social reality of gender inequality is constructed, enforced, and manifested from the largest institutional settings to the details of people's daily lives (Ngwainmbi, 2004).

**Perspectives on Feminism**

Feminism since its inception in the mid-1800s has branched into many movements, all of which identify themselves as 'feminist,' but vary in their philosophical perspectives. In order to help measure the diversity of feminist attitudes, the Feminist Perspective Scale (FPS) was created by Henley, Meng, O'Brien, McCarthy and Sockloskie (1998). This tool included six types of feminist perspectives that had been previously defined in feminist literature: liberal, socialist, radical, conservative, cultural, and women of color/womanist feminisms. While overviews of feminist perspectives generally focus on liberal, radical and socialist feminisms (Henley, et a., 1998), there are other feminist viewpoints that the authors of the FPS did not believe were adequately represented by other literature and feminist perspective scales. For this reason, included in the FPS are cultural, women of color/womanist and conservative feminisms. These philosophical perspectives of feminism are listed below:

**1. Liberal Feminism:** It is an individualistic form of feminist theory, which focuses on women's ability to maintain their equality through their own actions and choices. Liberal feminists argue that society holds the false belief that women are, by nature, less intellectually and physically capable than men; thus it tends to discriminate against women in the academy, the forum, and the marketplace. Liberal feminists believe that "female subordination is rooted in a set of customary and legal constraints that blocks women's entrance to and success in the so-called public world". They strive for sexual equality via down-to-earth political and legal reform. Classical liberals think the state should confine itself to protecting civil liberties (e.g., property rights, voting rights, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of association). They also think that, instead of interfering with the free market, the state should simply provide everyone with an equal opportunity to determine his or her own accumulations within that market. In contrast, welfare liberals believe the state should focus on economic disparities as well as civil liberties. As they see it, individuals enter the market with differences based on initial advantage, inherent talent, and sheer luck. (Tong, 1989). In the U.S., these groups have worked for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment or "Constitutional Equity Amendment", in the hopes it will ensure that men and women are treated as equals under the democratic laws that also influence important spheres of women's lives, including reproduction, work and equal pay

issues. Other issues important to liberal feminists include but are not limited to reproductive rights and abortion access, sexual harassment, voting, education, fair compensation for work, affordable childcare, affordable health care, and bringing to light the frequency of sexual and domestic violence against women. (Hooks, 1984)

**2. Radical Feminism:** Not all 1960s and 1970s feminists wanted to find a place for women in the "system." The feminists who formed groups such as the Red stockings, the Feminists, and the New York Radical Feminists perceived themselves as revolutionaries rather than reformers. Unlike reformist feminists, who joined fundamentally main-stream women's rights groups, these revolutionary feminists did not become interested in women's issues as a result of working for government agencies, being appointed to commissions on the status of women, or joining women's educational or professional groups. Instead, their desire to improve women's condition emerged in the context of their participation in radical social movements, such as the civil rights and anti–Vietnam War movements. Dubbed "radical feminists," these revolutionary feminists introduced into feminist thought the practice of consciousness-raising. Women came together in small groups and shared their personal experiences as women with each other. They discovered that their individual experiences were not unique to them but widely shared by many women. (Tong,1989).

Radical feminists have written about a wide range of issues regarding the sex industry – which they tend to oppose – including but not limited to: harm to women during the production of pornography, the social harm from consumption of pornography, the coercion and poverty that leads women to become prostitutes, the long-term effects of prostitution, the raced and classed nature of prostitution, and male dominance over women in prostitution and pornography. Radical lesbians are distinguished from other radical feminists through their ideological roots in political lesbianism. Radical lesbians see lesbianism as an act of resistance against the political institution of heterosexuality, which they view as violent and oppressive towards women.

**3. Socialist Feminism:** Socialist feminism is a two-pronged theory that broadens Marxist feminism's argument for the role of capitalism in the oppression of women and radical feminism's theory of the role of gender and the patriarchy. Socialist feminists reject radical feminism's main claim that patriarchy is the only or primary source of oppression of women (Buchanan, 2011).

Socialist feminists believe that the home is not just a place of consumption, but of production as well. Women's work within the home, having and raising children, as well as supporting men by doing cooking, cleaning, and other forms of housework which permit men to work outside the home, are all forms of production because they contribute to society at large. Production, according to socialist feminists, should not be measured in dollars, but rather in social worth. Socialist feminists propose the complete eradication of all political, economic and social

foundations of contemporary society. Specifically, education, work, sexuality and parenting must undergo thorough transformations. Sexual division of labor, which locks men and women into stereotypical occupational categories, must cease. Women should be permitted, respected and valued for all types of work within traditionally male as well as female fields, and adequately compensated for such work. They should be free from economic and gender specific constraints, even if it means reorganizing the family structure of sharing of child rearing responsibilities. They should be also be reunited with the fruits of their labor, by ending the alienation produced when they are forced to tailor their goals, personalities, and very lives to the wishes of men. (The Basics of Socialist Feminism, n.d.).

**4. Womanist/ Women of Colour:** Author and poet Alice Walker is credited with coining the term 'womanist.' From the original introduction of womanism as a social perspective, the term has evolved to envelop varied, and sometimes opposing definitions. Womanism has various definitions and interpretations. At its broadest definition, it is a universalist ideology for all women, regardless of color. A womanist is committed to "the survival and wholeness of an entire people, male and female". Linda Hogan asserts that the term womanist has come to represent a feminist of color, specifically black women, since the Feminist Movement has been experienced by many as intrinsically racist. While feminism can be alienating to minorities, womanism allows black women to affirm and celebrate their color and culture in a way that feminism does not. Alternatively, Delores Williams, a womanist theologian, associates womanism with the traditions and activism formed from the conditions, events, meanings and values within the African- American community. Williams further asserts that the task of the Womanist theologian is to embody activism by seeking out the voices of the unheard and the experiences of the neglected. She identifies the distinct difference between the experiences of the black woman and the white woman that makes it difficult to identify with feminism. One of the key components of feminism is to end a woman's subjugation to her male counterpart, yet there are other oppressive forces that black women face that takes precedence over the perceived subjugation of the black woman by the black man (Hogan,1995)**.**

**5. Cultural Feminism:** Cultural feminism takes an essentialist view that there are differences in the nature of men and women, and that female traits are superior to male traits. (Donovan, 1985; Echols, 1989; Saulnier, 2000) This perspective focuses on the culture of women (Lorber, 2005). According this perspective, women share the same "goodness", and this perspective focuses on creating a culture among women (Echols, 1989). Cultural feminists focus on the spirituality of women, stating that women are more connected to spirituality and the earth than men. In this perspective, differences, including those of race and class, are downplayed, in order to create a unity and culture among women (Saulnier, 2000).

**6. Conservative Feminism:** While conservative feminism may not be considered a feminist perspective by all (Jaggar & Rothenberg, 1993), it has implications for feminism, so it was

included in the FPS (Henley et al., 1998). According to Jaggar and Rothenberg (1993), conservative feminism is based on the assumption that the nature of men and women are different for biological and religious reasons. Based on biology, men and women have different capacities. For example, men are physically stronger and therefore more able to take on the role of provider and head of their family. Conservative feminists promote the idea that men and women have equal but complementary roles, and it would be unfair to both men and women to encourage them to complete tasks outside of their biological nature. Secondly, the religion argument adds to the idea that men are should have a societal status above women because they are ordained by a Superior Being (Henley, et al., 1998). (Enge, 2013).

**Table 1, Types of Feminism(Enge, 2013)**

|  | **Liberal** | **Radical** | **Socialist** | **Woman of Color/ Womanist** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ranked types of problems with highest severity | Political-legal dimensions (Freeman) | Sexual Reproductive Dimensions (Freeman) | Economically oriented problems (Freeman) | Racial inequality (hooks) |
| Causes of Sexism | Legal, Economic and cultural inequality created by the denial of equal opportunities based on sex (Eisenstein) | Male domination, patriarchy and systematic devaluation of women (Eisenstein) | Multiple sources of oppression (gender, class, race), gender status determined by relationships and historical factors (Eisenstein) | |

| | Liberal | Radical | Socialist | Woman of Color/ Womanist |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Causes of inequality | Inequality is the natural outcome of individual differences and in human potential and motivation. Inequality becomes a problem if things become too unequal or it is the result of discrimination. (Eisenstein) | All inequality is caused by patriarchy and sex-gender oppression. (Eisenstein) | Inequality is caused both by systems of class and patriarchy. Owners control production of things, men production of people (production and reproduction) (Eisenstein) | Racism, Poverty and ethnocentrism (hooks) |
| Natures of men and women | Men and women have the same nature. Women should become more competitive, assertive and individualistic. (Nes & Iadicola) | Men and women have different natures. Women's nature (more loving, caring and spiritual) should be viewed as equal (some might say better) to men (Nes & Iadicola) | Nature is reflected in human need and the current differences are due to the current sex-gender system. (Nes & Iadicola) | |
| How to gain equality | Achieved through legal reforms such as equal pay and employment opportunities (Sandell) | Eliminate patriarchy by women "combating their oppressors" and making female traits the basis of social order (Sandell) | Men and women work together to create mutual respect (Sandell) | Advocate for the specific needs of women of color (Henley, et al.) |
| Strategies | Organizing political | Consciousness-raising, | Organizing of oppressed groups | |

| | Liberal | Radical | Socialist | Woman of Color/ Womanist |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | interest groups and legal reforms to make sure women have equal opportunities as men in workforce (Nes&Iadicola) | organization of women only groups, promotion of androgynous practices (Nes& Iadicola) | and consciousness raising in order to help meet the needs of oppressed groups. Ultimately overthrow patriarchy, class and all other forms of oppression (Nes&Iadicola) | |

**Feminist Self-identification in India**

The truism that the women's movement is about women continues to hold. And yet, the task of speaking for and about women in this present moment represents an entirely new challenge for the women's movement in India. Unique to the present situation is the fact that identity issues have assumed a critical position in contemporary politics. These issues have in fact impacted on the women's question as well, so much so that within the space of the past decade and a half, the seeming coherence of the woman category has come to be debated within the movement itself.

The public discussions around the Shah Bano case, RoopKanwar's sati, Mandal agitation, the demolition of the Babri Masjid, the protests against the screening of Fire and the debate on the Women's Reservation Bill have, each in their own way, pushed for redefinition and clarification of the subject of feminism. The context for articulating the politics of feminism is, in each of these cases, provided by issues raised by different groups that have emphasized one particular identity. Strikingly, though these moments have been experienced as one of crisis for the women's movement, feminist rethinking within a force field dominated by questions of identity equally offers the possibility of fresh beginnings for the women's movement and its politics.

Feminist theory and politics have had to work within a paradox – of simultaneously denying the excess of identity attributed to women while also at the same time articulating a non-conventional identity based on the fact of being 'woman'. One gesture has always called into being the other as well. The campaigns against rape and violence in the 1970s for instance, though not self-consciously coded as identity issues, represent some of the early attempts within the movement to think through this  paradox of women's identity, of refiguring in effect women's embodied identities.

According to Everett, 'The upsurge of fundamentalism and communal violence in India over the past decade has led feminist scholars to analyze the interrelationships among the state, identity politics and gender' (emphasis mine, 2001: 2071). This assessment names one context, i.e. fundamentalism and communal violence, and accordingly describes the problem of identity politics (Pappu, 2001).

**Factors affecting feminist self-identification**

Based on a review of the available literature, Cooperstock (2010) identifies life experiences, socio-demographic factors, maternal background, perceptions of feminism, declining civic participation, and certain behaviors as predictive of feminist self-identification. Whereas life experiences (political orientation, education and experiences of discrimination), socio-demographic factors (race, environment, age and household income) and maternal background (educational attainment and work history) are all positively correlated with feminist identification, perceptions of feminism are either positively or negatively correlated (depending on the nature of one's feminist beliefs). Putnam (1995) asserts that declining civic participation in general negatively influences involvement and membership in feminist organizations (Cooperstock, 2010).

**Westernisation of feminist self-identification in India**

Since the 1990s, interest in the Indian women's movement has grown considerably, in the form of major studies and important articles (Gandhi and Shah 1992; Kumar 1993; Tharu, and Lalita 1993; Tharu and Niranjana 1994; Agnihotri and Mazumdar 1995). Scholarship on the history of struggles against patriarchal oppression, along with critical assessments of an equally significant history of feminist intervention are continuously being revised and deepened. Taking all this into account, and that too at a moment when India is entering a new global phase amidst appraisals of fifty years of independence, might make questions about the Westernness of feminism appear dated, a problem that we have put well behind us.

What makes the issue particularly difficult to get a handle on is that those in the women's movement who have identified a problem in feminism's relation to the west, seem to have missed its essential aspects. Thus, for instance, Madhu Kishwar has gone on record to say that she does not call herself a feminist because feminism is too tied up with its western origins, from where universal agendas emanate, but which are inapplicable elsewhere. Feminists in India suffer from being too western-identified, when they should be more concerned with analysing local women's issues 'on their own terms'. (Kishwar 1991).

Sarojini Naidu and Begum Shah Nawaz both declared that the Indian women's movement was not a "feminist" one like the Western movement; V. Rainakrishna Rao displayed an unequivocal distaste for the "sheer grasping suffragette", bemoaning the loss of Sita and Savitri; and Cornelia Sorabjee linked the newfound assertiveness of many Indian women with the "Western

influence". (Kumar 1993:88). Similar accusations appear to have been made many decades later in the first years of Hindu Code Bill. Neera Desai has recalled how, during the 1970s, when a significantly new phase of the women's movement came into being in many parts of the country, a distinct 'allergy' attached to feminism. (Desai 1995:250). Flavia Agnes has also remarked on how Indian feminists, in an effort to counter attacks of being western, relied on 'Hindu iconography and Sanskrit idioms denoting woman power, thus inadvertently strengthening the communal ideology that Indian, Hindu and Sanskrit are synonymous' (Flavia 1994:1124) (John,1998).

## Support for feminism
Support for feminist ideas has grown in many societies due to women's increasing role in raising public awareness. In Spain, solidarity campaigns with political prisoners were used to mobilize enough public support to make changes (Astelarra in Bystydzienski: 45). Britain has seen significant alteration in public opinion concerning abortion, housework and employment. Feminist ideas that seemed ludicrous in 1970 are widely accepted today (Lovenduski and Randall, 1993: 357)

The simple assertion by feminists that women have rights that should be protected has made a significant impact on worldwide politics and provided a starting point for women to question and change the rules and norms that govern them. The number of women in positions of power is increasing alongside changes in legislation and public opinion. Feminism has had a significant impact on politics around the world. Feminist thought has made women aware of their rights and the possibility of improving their lives. It has increased their confidence by revealing the politics in their daily lives and encouraging political and social participation. Women's groups have succeeded in getting female candidates elected to all levels of government and altering legislation. They have also made changes in their daily lives, on a community and domestic level, and made significant steps towards changing public opinion.

However, the impact that feminists can have depends on many factors outside their control. Women's participation in legislatures is aided by the presence of left-wing groups and ideas; particularly during revolutions in which women contribute substantially. The culture and public opinion within which women's groups function plays a significant role in determining their impact. Currently many women struggle not only against traditional cultures of male dominance but also against a recent religious and conservative backlash (NI: 10). Challenges to women are coming increasingly from men who believe that women's rights have gone too far. In Sweden's 1991 elections, the number of women in government declined for the first time. This is thought to be the result of a backlash triggered by the appointment of women to cabinet positions not seen to be traditionally 'feminine' (Davis, 1997: 86). Women's position as 'mothers of the nation' often make them important symbols in revolutionary situations. In Nicaragua, mothers of Sandinista soldiers were highly respected and able to use this to their advantage (Puar in Afshar,

1996: 80). However, women's importance in this context can often lead to strict controls on their behaviour, aiming to ensure that they are appropriate representatives of their nation (Waylen in Afshar, 1996: 15). Women's participation has notably decreased in countries emerging from socialism into systems further to the political right, usually accompanied by attacks on women's rights. In countries newly opened up to capitalism or neo-liberalism the effect is the opposite and women's rights tend to be threatened. Culture, in particular recent religious and conservative backlashes, has also served to restrict the impact of feminism (Smith, 2007).

**Third-wave feminism, post feminism and modern feminism**
Third-wave feminism refers to several diverse strains of feminist activity and study, whose exact boundaries in the history of feminism are a subject of debate, but are generally marked as beginning in the early 1990s and continuing to the present. The movement arose partially as a response to the perceived failures of and backlash against initiatives and movements created by second-wave feminism during the 1960s, '70s, and '80s, and the perception that women are of "many colors, ethnicities, nationalities, religions, and cultural backgrounds". This wave of feminism expands the topic of feminism to include a diverse group of women with a diverse set of identities (Hewitt, 2010). Third Wave feminists have broadened their goals, focusing on ideas like queer theory, and abolishing gender role expectations and stereotypes. Unlike the determined position of second wave feminists about women in pornography, sex work, and prostitution, third-wave feminists were rather ambiguous and divided about these themes. (Lamb, 2009).

Post-feminism describes a range of viewpoints reacting to feminism. While not being "anti-feminist," post-feminists believe that women have achieved second wave goals while being critical of third wave feminist goals. The term was first used in the 1980s to describe a backlash against second-wave feminism. It is now a label for a wide range of theories that take critical approaches to previous feminist discourses and includes challenges to the second wave's ideas. Other post-feminists say that feminism is no longer relevant to today's society. Post-feminism gives the impression that equality has been achieved and that feminists can now focus on something else entirely (History and Theory of Feminism, n.d.).

Today's modern feminism is a corruption of what feminism should be. It is the immoral detour taken by today's feminists away from real issues of freedom. Instead, successful women who have soared to great heights choose to feast at a smorgasbord of whinges and whines, victimhood claims and misogyny games, and Western world obsessions about pay gaps, quotas and glass ceilings. The notion of triage — of prioritizing problems, of addressing those who most need help — has been inverted by modern feminism. The scandal of modern feminism is its strategic silence on real issues of freedom for women. It's much easier to talk about feminist labels and confected misogyny than female genital mutilation or child brides or so-called honour killings

which, logically, may require you to make judgments about cultures that -oppress women (Albrechtsen, 2015).

The feminist insistence that women behave like men and make as much money as men do may not be the sole reason for women's rising levels of dissatisfaction with life; a greater incidence of divorce and single motherhood may also contribute to it. At any event, the culpability of modern feminism in making women steadily unhappy, because it is based on false assumptions about male and female human nature, is difficult to deny. Men's happiness has not declined in the last 35 years, because there has not been masculinism; nobody has insisted on the radical notion that men are women, although, as Christina Hoff Sommers documents, this may be happening in our current war against boys (Crittenden, 2007)**.**

In a forthcoming article in the American Economic Journal: Economic Policy, Betsey Stevenson and Justin Wolfers of the Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania show that American women over the last 35 years have steadily become less and less happy, as they have made more and more money relative to men. Women used to be a lot happier than men despite the fact that they made much less money than men. The sex gap in happiness (in women's favor) has declined in the past 35 years as the sex gap in pay (in men's favor) narrowed (Kanazawa, 2009).

**Feminism in Single-Sex and Co-educational Institutions**
There is an emerging pattern in research findings to suggest that when the culture within a school matches that of the families who send their children to the school, the academic success is higher. So, the greater the agreement between school expectations and family expectations the more likely the child is to conform to the school culture and recognize academic expectations. When there is a conflict between school culture and what parents expect of their children then children and young people face challenges in coming to recognize school and academic expectations and accept them. Therefore in strongly gender-segregated societies, for example, with recognizably different social roles for men and women, attending single sex schools reinforces the segregated gender roles in society. This sets up a dilemma for feminist educationalists and raises the wider questions about the purposes of education. Should education maintain the social status quo or change it?

Throughout the history of gender and education, schools have been viewed as important sites for social change and places to foster the development of more equal societies with less oppressive social conditions for women. There are different ways to approach the question about the benefits of single sex schools. Some feminist academics argue that women need to have academic success before they can take up roles in public domains and so influence laws, policies and the conditions of all women within society. According to the first position single sex schools may give girls the edge in academic success because lessons can be designed to tap into girls'

interests and so motivate them specifically in subjects that have masculine connotations such as the sciences. Others argue that schools should be places that model equality and so provide young people with early experiences and knowledge of gender equality, otherwise they will reproduce the unequal gender patterns that they encounter outside school in their later lives. According to the second position, co-educational schooling may be seen as a route towards greater gender equality. However, given that in most societies, gender inequalities are structural, teachers need to have enough gender awareness to prevent gendered inequalities being imperceptibly reproduced through their pedagogic practice.

Although the current educational climate is one in which academic performance and the acquisition of credentials are emphasized, it is important not to downplay the significance of educational experiences for children. Much small-scale research undertaken in the 1970s and 1980s suggested that girls' experiences in co-educational schools were problematic in a variety of ways. For example, research suggested that: teachers were more intellectually encouraging to, and demanding of, boys and rewarded girls for good, appropriately 'feminine' behaviour; boys dominated in the classroom, both in terms of space and teacher time; sexual harassment of girls by boys in the classroom was not uncommon; and boys' contributions to classroom discussion were taken more seriously than girls' contributions.

However, it is important to note that not all boys dominate classroom space and not all girls are quiet, and research conducted more recently tends to be more attentive than work conducted in the 1970s and 1980s to differences within gender groups, as well as between them. Nevertheless, although factors such as social class, 'race' and ethnicity can be as important as gender for shaping how young people experience schooling, evidence suggests that the gendered patterns of behaviour identified in the 1970s and 1980s persist in co-educational schools today. Of course, this does not mean that single-sex schools offer wholly positive experiences for all children, and this is an area that would benefit from more research.

There is very little research on the long-term social consequences of single-sex and co-educational schooling. Nevertheless, many advocates of co-education argue that mixed schools are essential so that girls and boys can learn to live and work together. In general, their argument is that schools should reflect 'real' life (presumably out-of-school life), and as society is mixed, schools should also be mixed.

Some advocates of girls' schools, on the other hand, argue the opposite. They suggest that the fact that girls' schools do not mirror 'real life' is a key reason to have them. They argue that generally, western societies are male-dominated and women are frequently second place to men in terms of, amongst other things, opportunities, pay and power. So students and teachers need to challenge and change these inequalities rather than reproduce them in schools. Proponents of this argument suggest that single-sex schools can be spaces where girls can begin to challenge male

dominance and power, where girls can learn that they do not have to take second place to boys, that they can work free from harassment and taunts, and that they can do science.

The little empirical evidence that exists regarding the long-term social consequences of single-sex and mixed schooling reveals no consistent differences in the personal development of girls and boys in these school types. Evidence suggests, for example, there are no significant differences between students who attend single-sex schools and students who attend co-educational schools in terms of how easy or difficult they find it to adjust socially to university life. Overall though, this is yet another area where we have more unanswered than answered questions. (Jackson & Ivinson,2013).

**Feminist positions in single-sex and coeducational institutions**
Supporters of single-sex schooling hold what we term the "girl power" view, citing the problem of domineering boys in coeducational classrooms as a reason for separating boys and girls. In coeducational classrooms, boys tend to seek out and receive the majority of teachers' attention, particularly in math and science (Lee, Marks, & Byrd, 1994). Furthermore, educators worry that boys' sexist attitudes and behaviors decrease girls' interest in traditionally masculine STEM fields (Lee et al., 1994; Sadker & Sadker, 1994; Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman, 2009). Classrooms that do not include males, they argue, are more supportive of girls' academic achievement in counter stereotypic domains (Shapka& Keating, 2003). The reasoning goes that, in single-sex classrooms, girls can develop self-confidence in mathematics and science; that is, single-sex classrooms are empowering to girls (hence our term "girl power"). This view is consistent with social psychologists' emphasis on the crucial importance of social context and social interaction in influencing students' behavior (Rudman & Glick, 2008)

Developmental intergroup theory (DIT) posits that social factors that make gender salient, such as single-sex schooling, will lead to greater gender stereotyping (Bigler & Liben, 2006, 2007). DIT therefore does not make specific predictions for outcomes such as mathematics performance, but it does make predictions about gender stereotyping in Single-sex schooling. In the study by Pahlke (2013), it was found that girls in coed classrooms are more gender stereotyped, a pattern that is the opposite of predictions from DIT.

The theoretical approach termed "girl power" argues that girls are dominated by boys in coed classrooms, especially in male-stereotyped domains such as mathematics and science; the result is that girls' performance suffers. Girls therefore should thrive in mathematics and science in SS schools. This approach is silent as to how boys will fare under the two different conditions. Girls in SS schooling showed only trivial differences from girls in coed schooling for the outcomes of mathematics performance, mathematics attitudes, and science performance. Moreover, girls' educational aspirations were not higher when they were in SS schooling, nor was their self-concept more positive under conditions of SS schooling.

A theoretical assumption underlying many SS programs is the view that gender differences in psychological characteristics relevant to learning are substantial and are biological in nature—what we have called the large biological differences assumption. Boys and girls therefore need to be taught differently. According to this view, both boys and girls should have better outcomes in SS classrooms compared with CE classrooms. The controlled studies by Pahlke (2013) showed no substantial advantages of SS schooling for either girls or boys, across an array of academic outcomes (Pahlke, Hyde & Allison, 2014).

**Solutions to the dichotomy in SS and Co-ed institutions**
First, feminists need to redouble our efforts to require gender egalitarian environments in our coeducational schools. Evidence suggests that even elementary school-age girls can learn to successfully advocate feminist goals and make allies and advocates of male peers. Whereas single-sex schools model the idea that gender exclusion is the answer to sexism, co-educational schools model the notion that the sexes must work together warmly and supportively. By working for these conditions, feminists can do more to support both girls and boys than by advocating single-sex schooling.

Second, feminists who favor girls' schools have fallen for the myth that parents and educators can reliably identify particular girls who will benefit from an all-girls' environment. Most proponents of single-sex schooling readily admit that it is not suitable for all, but they nonetheless believe it should be a choice for a minority of girls (and boys). What "type" of girl is that? There are vague suggestions: girls with low self-confidence who won't compete with boys; girls with strong libidos who are distracted by boys; girls with low body satisfaction who are embarrassed to be near boys; girls who strongly dislike boys. But none of these beliefs is backed by research, and in fact, still other research tells us that the girls who are successful in single-sex settings are the same ones who would be successful in coeducational classrooms.

In any other situation, when schools offer special educational environments, it is because some diagnostic test is used to identify students (those with dyslexia, say) requiring special learning conditions. But in the absence of such measures, the decision to send a girl to an all girls' school rests solely on parents' judgment and is often based on precisely the kind of stereotyping they profess to be protecting their daughters from.

Instead of letting gender exclusion and essentialist attitudes back into schools, we believe feminists should celebrate girls' dramatic educational achievements (Bigler & Eliot, 2011).

**OBJECTIVE**
The purpose of the current research was to study dichotomously the differences in feminism perspectives, support for feminism and degree of feminist self-identification between students in

single-sex, and students in co-educational, higher learning institutions, with special emphasis on students with chronic single-sex/co-ed schooling and students with discontinuous single-sex/co-ed schooling.

*Hypotheses*

This study tested four hypotheses:

('schooling' here refers to both school and college)

**Hypothesis 1.** Female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger support for feminism than students in co-educational higher learning institutions.

**Hypothesis 2a.** Female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger positions on liberal perspective of feminism than students in co-educational higher learning institutions.

**Hypothesis 2b.** Female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger positions on radical perspective of feminism than students in co-educational higher learning institutions.

**Hypothesis 2c.** Female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger positions on socialist perspective of feminism than students in co-educational higher learning institutions.

**Hypothesis 2d.** Female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger positions on womanist perspective of feminism than students in co-educational higher learning institutions.

**Hypothesis 3a.** Students in chronic and discontinuous single-sex schooling show stronger support for feminism than students with chronic co-ed schooling.

**Hypothesis 3b:** Students in chronic single-sex schooling have higher feminist self-identification than students in discontinuous co-ed.

**Hypothesis 4.** Students in single-sex institutions show higher degree of feminist self-identification than students in co-educational institutions.

## METHODOLOGY

*Sample*

The sample comprised 100 undergraduate and graduate students in colleges all over India falling in the age group 18 to 23 years. Of the 100 respondents, 84 were female and 16 were male. 50% of the respondents were from co-ed higher institutions and 50% were from single-sex higher institutions. The sample was widely distributed geographically.

*Research Design*

The purpose of this paper was to study dichotomously the differences in feminism perspectives, support for feminism and degree of feminist self-identification between students in single-sex and students in co-educational, higher learning institutions, with emphasis on chronic and

discontinuous single-sex or co-educational schooling. This study focused on whether the difference in educational structure (co-educational / single-sex) has an impact on the extent to which the students support feminism and the degree of their feminist self-identification. The target sample was undergraduates and graduates in colleges in India, falling in the age group of 18-23 years. The sample size for this study was 100. It was a descriptive and confirmatory research. Feminist Perspective Scale (Henley, et. al., 1998), Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS) by Morgan (1996) and a question on Feminist self-identification by Morgan (1996) were used to create a Survey Questionnaire. The Questionnaire included 51 7-point Likert scale type, close-ended questions. (See **Appendix A**)

*Measures*

This study included questions from the liberal, radical and socialist and women of color/womanist subscales of Feminist Perspective Scale (Henley, et. al., 1998) to study perspectives on feminism, the 11-item short form of the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS) by Morgan (1996) to study support for feminism, and a closed-ended question from Morgan (1996) to measure self-identified feminism.

**Support for Feminism.** Support for feminism was measured with the short form of the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS). The LFAIS reflects the three general themes of women's discrimination and subordination, collective action for women's equality, and sisterhood. The LFAIS has good convergent, divergent, and known-groups validity and demonstrated reliability. For 234 respondents, Cronbach's alpha on the 11-item short form was .81, indicating the reliability of the scale (Morgan, 1996). The 11-item short form has high internal reliability and correlates significantly with behaviors such as writing letters in favor of women's rights, responses to sexist insults, and the recognition of sexism in a commercial. The LFAIS appears to be a subtle measure of feminism. It does not use the words ''feminist'' or ''women's movement'' and therefore represents a more ''covert'' type of feminism.

**Feminism Perspectives.** The feminist perspectives of each participant were determined through use of the Feminist Perspective Scale (Henley, et. al., 1998) which asked Likert scale questions. This scale measures a respondent's feminist perspective using the following subscales: liberal, radical, socialist, cultural, women of color/womanist and conservative perspectives. This study included questions from the liberal, radical, socialist and women of color/womanist perspectives subscales of the original questionnaire. Each question contained 7-point Likert scale options, which participants were asked to rate their agreement from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The items addressing the cultural perspective were not included due to its low reliability and lack of support in the research. The conservative domain was also not included, as it was not considered a feminist perspective by many sources (Jaggar& Rothenberg, 1993). The FPS was tested by Henley et al. for reliability using Cronach's alpha coefficient (1998). They found that the liberal subscale had the lowest reliability of the four perspectives with a coefficient of .58.

The radical, socialist, and women of color/womanist subscales were higher with coefficients of .84, .78 and .75. The liberal, radical, socialist and women of color/womanist subscales had high test-retest reliability with coefficients of .73, .85, .86 and .85 over a two week period and coefficients of .72, .81, .73 and .80 over a four week period. Validity of each of the subscales was measured by comparing subscale means for respondents professing different political identifications.

**Self-identification.** A closed-ended question from Morgan (1996), ''To what extent do you consider yourself a feminist?'' was used to measure self-identified feminism. This question was answered by choosing one of eight options ranging from ''Committed feminist currently active in the women's movement'' (8) to ''I do not consider myself a feminist at all and I believe that feminists are harmful to family life and undermine relations between men and women'' (1). This item pointedly refers to feminism and requests that the individual self-identify in regards to feminism. It represents a more ''overt'' feminism.

*Procedure*
Data for this study were collected during a one week period in December 2015. A message containing a brief description of the study, link of the survey and a request to participate was generated and circulated among students falling in the target age group across various colleges in India through social networking applications and sites. Regardless of recruitment method, all participants completed the study through an internet-based survey. The web survey was set-up and run on a secure web server (Google Forms). To complete the survey, participants visited the prepared link

(https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1ImhGDWfESxrTt_Hdd4VFtg7MvRJG0rRIyyCNIESTTDQ/edit ).

Each response saved itself in an online excel sheet which was accessible only to the researchers so as to maintain confidentiality. Data collection continued till the target sample size of 100 was achieved. The sample was then divided into six independent groups for the purpose of statistical analysis. The groups are explained as follows. ('Schooling' here includes both school and undergraduate or graduate college)

Co-ed: Students who are presently in (or have graduated from) a co-ed college.
Single-sex: Students who are presently in (or have graduated from) a single-sex college.
Chronic co-ed: Students who have had a co-educational schooling all their lives.
Chronic single-sex: Students who have had a single-sex schooling all their lives.
Discontinuous co-ed: Students who moved from a single-sex school (or after frequently changing school types) to a co-ed college.
Discontinuous single-sex: Students who moved from a co-ed school (or after frequently changing school types) to a single-sex college.

**Table 2, Sample size of respondents in Co-educational and Single-sex higher institutions**

| Group | Sample size |
|---|---|
| Co-ed | 50 |
| Single-sex | 50 |
| **Total** | **100** |

**Table 3**, **Division of co-educational and single-sex sample into chronic and discontinuous**

| Group | Sample size |
|---|---|
| Chronic co-ed | 33 |
| Chronic single-sex | 13 |
| Discontinuous co-ed | 17 |
| Discontinuous single-sex | 37 |
| **Total** | **100** |

Note: For students pursuing masters and falling in the target age group of the sample, the college they graduated from was considered for the study. For undergraduates, the college they are presently in was considered for the study.

ANOVA and t test on the data were calculated using VASSARSTATS.

## RESULT

*Table 4 Means and S.D.s (in bracket) of various constructs*

| Schooling arrangements | Co-ed | Single-sex | Chronic Co-ed | Chronic Single-sex | Discontinuous Co-ed | Discontinuous Single-sex |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Scales** | | | | | | |
| LFAIS | 59.72 (7.01) | 64.42 (6.78) | 58.72 (7.01) | 62.31 (8.79) | 61.65 (6.81) | 65.16 (5.89) |
| FPS (Liberal) | 54.38 (6.68) | 54.52 (9.04) | 53.27 (6.59) | 54.08 (9.74) | 56.53 (6.52) | 54.68 (8.91) |
| FPS (Radical) | 42 (11.92) | 47.66 (9.97) | 41 (12.37) | 46.08 (9.99) | 43.94 (11.1) | 48.22 (10.04) |
| FPS (Socialist) | 43.36 (9.23) | 44.7 (9.28) | 41.93 (9.46) | 42.54 (9.56) | 46.12 (8.36) | 45.46 (9.2) |
| FPS (Womanist) | 49.08 (8.9) | 51.46 (9.07) | 47.75 (8.84) | 51.69 (8.22) | 51.65 (8.7) | 51.38 (9.46) |
| Feminist Self-identification | 5.22 (1.61) | 6.2 (1.32) | 5.30 (1.74) | 6.31 (1.25) | 5.06 (1.34) | 6.16 (1.36) |

*Table 5, t-test on LFAIS scores of single-sex and coed students*

| Mean$_a$ - Mean$_b$ | t critical | t calculated | df | p (one-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4.7 | 2.63(at 0.005) | +3.41 | 98 | 0.00047 |

According to Table 5, the p-value is 0.00047 which is much less than 0.05 and hence, the difference between the means (i.e, 4.7) is extremely significant. The critical value of student's t at significance level 0.005 is 2.63. The t calculated is 3.41, which is greater than t critical. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. **Thus the hypothesis 1 that "Female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger support for feminism than students in co-educational higher learning institutions." is proved**, with 0.5% chance of Type II error.

*Table 6, t-test on FPS Liberal subscale scores for single-sex and co-ed students*

| Mean$_a$ - Mean$_b$ | t critical | t | df | p (one-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0.14 | 1.66 (at 0.05) | +0.09 | 98 | 0.46 |

Table 6 shows that the p-value is 0.46 which is greater than 0.05, implying that there is no significant difference in the variances of the two samples. The critical value of student's t at significance level 0.05 is 1.66, which is greater than the t calculated, 0.09. Hence, there is no significant difference between the means of the two samples and **the hypothesis 2a, that " Female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger positions on liberal perspective of feminism than students in co-educational higher learning institutions" is rejected** and the null hypothesis is retained, with 5% chance of Type I error.

*Table 7, t-test on FPS Radical subscale scores for single-sex and co-ed students*

| Mean$_a$ - Mean$_b$ | t critical | t calculated | df | p (one-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5.66 | 2.365 (at 0.01) | +2.57 | 98 | 0.0058 |

Table 7 shows that the p-value is 0.0058 which is much less than 0.05 and hence, the difference between the means (i.e, 5.66) is extremely significant. The critical value of student's t at significance level 0.01 is 2.365. The t calculated is 2.57, which is greater than t critical. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus **the hypothesis 2b that " Female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger positions on radical perspective of feminism than students in co-educational higher learning institutions." is proved**, with a 1% chance of Type II error.

*Table 8, t-test on FPS Socialist subscale scores for single-sex and co-ed students*

| Mean$_a$ - Mean$_b$ | t critical | t calculated | df | p (one-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.34 | 1.66 (at 0.05) and 0.67 (at 0.25) | +0.72 | 98 | 0.24 |

As shown in Table 8, the p-value is 0.24 which is greater than 0.05, implying that there is no significant difference in the variances of the two samples. The critical value of student's t at significance level 0.05 is 1.66, which is greater than the t calculated, 0.72. Hence, there is no significant difference between the means of the two samples and **the hypothesis 2c, that " Female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger positions on socialist perspective of feminism than students in co-educational higher learning institutions" is rejected** and the null hypothesis is retained, with 5% chance of Type I error.

*Table 9, t-test on FPS Womanist subscale scores for single sex and co-ed students*

| Mean$_a$ - Mean$_b$ | t critical | t calculated | df | p (one-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.38 | 1.66 (at 0.05) and 1.29 (at 0.1) | +1.32 | 98 | 0.095 |

Table 9 shows that the p-value is 0.095 which is greater than 0.05, implying that there is no significant difference in the variances of the two samples. The critical value of student's t at significance level 0.05 is 1.66, which is greater than the t calculated, 1.32. Hence, there is no significant difference between the means of the two samples and **the hypothesis 2d, that " Female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger positions on womanist perspective of feminism than students in co-educational higher learning institutions" is rejected** and the null hypothesis is retained, with 5% chance of Type I error.

*Table 10, t-test on LFAIS scores for chronic and discontinuous single sex, and chronic co-ed students*

| Mean$_a$ - Mean$_b$ | t critical | t calculated | df | p (one-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5.69 | 2.64 (at 0.005) | +3.69 | 81 | 0.0002 |

As shown in Table 10, the p-value obtained was 0.0002, which is much lesser than 0.05 and hence, the difference between the means (i.e, 5.69) is extremely significant. The critical value of student's t at significance level 0.005 is 2.64. The t calculated is 3.69, which is greater than t critical. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus **the hypothesis 3a that " Students in chronic and discontinuous single-sex schooling show stronger support for feminism than students with chronic coed schooling." is proved**, with 0.5% chance of Type II error.

*Table 11, ANOVA summary for means of LFAIS scores on chronic co-ed, chronic single-sex, discontinuous co-ed, discontinuous single-sex students*

| ANOVA SUMMARY Independent Samples k=4 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Source | df | SS | MS | F | P |
| Treatment [between groups] | 3 | 726.2859 | 242.0953 | 5.18 | 0.002 |
| Error | 96 | 4488.2241 | 46.7523 | - | - |
| Total | 99 | 5214.51 | - | - | - |

*Table 12, Turkey HSD test*

| | |
|---|---|
| **HSD[.05]=5.55; HSD[.01]=6.8** <br> **M1 vs M2  no significant** <br> **M1 vs M3  non significant** <br> **M1 vs M4  P<.05** <br> **M2 vs M3  non significant** <br> **M2 vs M4  non significant** <br> **M3 vs M4  non significant** | **M1 - Mean of chronic co-ed sample** <br> **M2 - Mean of chronic single-sex sample** <br> **M3 - Mean of discontinuous co-ed sample** <br> **M4 - Mean of discontinuous single-sex sample** <br><br> **HSD = the absolute [unsigned] difference between any two sample means required for significance at the designated level. HSD[.05] for the .05 level; HSD[.01] for the .01 level.** |

*Table 13, t test on LFAIS scores for discontinuous single sex and chronic co-ed*

| Mean$_a$ - Mean$_b$ | t critical | t calculated | df | p (one-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6.43 | 2.65 (at 0.005) | +4.17 | 68 | < .0001 |

Significant difference between groups was determined by one-way ANOVA (F= 5.18, p = 0.002)(see Table 11). A Tukey post-hoc (HSD) test revealed that the support for feminism was statistically significantly different in students from chronic coed and discontinuous single-sex schooling arrangements, with the latter being significantly greater than the former (see Table 12). There was no statistically significant difference between the support for feminism amongst the other schooling arrangement combinations.

A t-test was done on the LFAIS scores of discontinuous single-sex and chronic coed students. As shown in Table 13, the p-value obtained was <0.0001 which is much less than 0.05 and hence, the difference between the means (i.e, 6.43) is extremely significant. The critical value of student's t at significance level 0.005 is 2.65. The t calculated is 4.17, which is greater than t critical. **Thus, it can also be inferred that support for feminism is significantly higher in students in discontinuous single-sex schooling than students in chronic coed schooling.**

*Table 14, ANOVA summary for means of Feminist Self-identification scores on chronic co-ed,
chronic single-sex , discontinuous coed, discontinuous single-sex students*

| ANOVA SUMMARY Independent Samples k=4 | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Source** | **df** | **SS** | **MS** | **F** | **P** |
| **Treatment [between groups]** | 3 | 24.8829 | 8.2943 | 3.76 | 0.01 |
| **Error** | 96 | 211.7071 | 2.2053 | - | - |
| **Total** | 99 | 236.59 | - | - | - |

*Table 15, Turkey HSD test*

| | |
|---|---|
| **HSD[.05]=1.21; HSD[.01]=1.48**<br>**M1 vs M2  non significant**<br>**M1 vs M3  non significant**<br>**M1 vs M4  non significant**<br>**M2 vs M3  P<.05**<br>**M2 vs M4  non significant**<br>**M3 vs M4  non significant** | **M1 - Mean of chronic coed sample**<br>**M2 - Mean of chronic single-sex sample**<br>**M3 - Mean of discontinuous coed sample**<br>**M4 - Mean of discontinuous single-sex sample**<br><br>**HSD = the absolute [unsigned] difference between any two sample means required for significance at the designated level. HSD[.05] for the .05 level; HSD[.01] for the .01 level.** |

*Table 16, t-test on Feminist self-identification scores for chronic single-sex and discontinuous
co-ed students*

| Mean$_a$ - Mean$_b$ | t critical | t calculated | df | p (one-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.25 | 2.46 (at 0.01) | +2.6 | 28 | 0.007 |

Significant difference between groups was determined by one-way ANOVA (F= 3.76, p
=0.01)(see Table 14). A Tukey post-hoc (HSD) test revealed that the feminist self-identification
was statistically significantly different in students from chronic single-sex and discontinuous
coed schooling arrangements, with the former being significantly greater than the latter (see
Table 15). There was no statistically significant difference between the feminist self-
identification amongst the other schooling arrangement combinations.

A t-test was done on the Feminist Self-identification scores of chronic single-sex and
discontinuous coed students. As shown in Table 16, the p-value obtained was 0.007 which is
much less than 0.05 and hence, the difference between the means (i.e, 1.25) is extremely

significant. The critical value of student's t at significance level 0.01 is 2.46. The t calculated is 2.6, which is greater than t critical. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus **the hypothesis 3b, that "Students in chronic single-sex schooling have higher feminist self-identification than students in discontinuous coed" is proved**, with 1% probability of Type II error.

*Table 17, t-test on Feminist self-identification scores for single-sex and co-ed students*

| Mean$_a$ - Mean$_b$ | t critical | t calculated | Df | p (one-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0.98 | 2.62 (at 0.005) | +3.33 | 98 | 0.0006 |

As shown in Table 17, the p-value obtained was 0.0006, which is much lesser than 0.05 and hence, the difference between the means (i.e, 0.98) is extremely significant. The critical value of student's t at significance level 0.005 is 2.62. The t calculated is 3.33, which is greater than t critical. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus **the hypothesis 4 that "Students in single-sex higher learning institutions show higher degree of feminist self-identification than students in co-educational higher learning institutions." is proved**, with 0.5% chance of Type II error.

## DISCUSSION

The objective of the study was to test the differences in feminism perspectives (liberal, radical, socialist, womanist), differences in support for feminism, and differences in feminist self-identification between students in single-sex and students in coeducational higher learning institutions. The study also lays special emphasis on students who have had a chronic single-sex or coed schooling, and students who have had a discontinuous single-sex or coed schooling. Social psychologists have been divided in their views regarding the advantages and disadvantages of single-sex and coed educational environment, both in terms of the academic achievements and the gender stereotyping seen in students. Developmental intergroup theory (DIT) posits that social factors that make gender salient, such as single-sex schooling, will lead to greater gender stereotyping (Bigler & Liben, 2006, 2007). DIT therefore does not make specific predictions for outcomes such as mathematics performance, but it does make predictions about gender stereotyping in Single-sex schooling. However, in the study by Pahlke (2013), it was found that girls in coed classrooms are more gender stereotyped a pattern that is the opposite of predictions from DIT.

College campuses have long been incubators of feminism. Hercampus.com, a website that supports the feminist movement among college-aged women, in 2012 assembled a list of the most feminist colleges in America. The list boasts all of the schools are "full of girl power" and that they "bring women's and gender issues to the forefront of campus culture" (Hilton, 2012). The same website also surveyed 3,135 college women between the ages of 17 and 23 from all regions of the United States and found that among these women, 78.3 percent identify as

feminist — which is much greater than the adult US population as a whole, where only 23 percent of women identify as feminist according to a HuffPo/YouGov poll. The poll shows that about 57 percent of women surveyed identified as feminist before college, but once in college, that number goes up to 78.3 percent. In fact, among all the women in the survey, 26 percent became feminists in college, and only 1.3 percent were feminists before college but now aren't (Cueto, 2015; Swanson, 2013).

This makes it essential to dichotomously study the differences in the intensity of feminism-related ideologies held by students in both kinds of educational environments (coed and single-sex), as well as how those ideologies change if one kind of schooling is discontinued to move to the other. For this, the study assessed these feminism-related ideologies in a sample of 100 undergraduates and graduates (age group 18-23) studying in higher learning institutions all over India, through a survey questionnaire that included three feminism scales: the liberal, radical, socialist and women of color/womanist subscales of Feminist Perspective Scale (Henley, et. al., 1998) to study perspectives on feminism, the 11-item short form of the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS) by Morgan (1996) to study support for feminism, and a closed-ended question "To what extent do you consider yourself a feminist?" from Morgan (1996) to measure feminist self-identification.

The study included 8 distinct hypothesis regarding the differences across these factors in single-sex, coed, chronic coed, chronic single-sex, discontinuous coed and discontinuous single-sex students:

**Hypothesis 1.** This hypothesis predicted that female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger support for feminism than students in co-educational higher learning institutions. The hypothesis was supported, with high statistically significant difference between the LFAIS scores of single-sex and coed students. Thus, female students from single-sex institutions showed greater support for feminism than students from coed institutions. This difference in support for feminism could be attributed to the difference in college learning environment that students receive in both these colleges. The difference could also be said to be an indirect result of comparatively greater academic opportunities for female students in single-sex institutions, which gives them a sense of power. In coeducational classrooms, boys tend to seek out and receive the majority of teachers' attention, particularly in math and science (Lee, Marks, & Byrd, 1994). Furthermore, educators worry that boys' sexist attitudes and behaviors decrease girls' interest in traditionally masculine STEM fields (Lee et al., 1994; Sadker & Sadker, 1994; Sadker, Sadker, & Zittleman, 2009). Classrooms that do not include males, they argue, are more supportive of girls' academic achievement in counter stereotypic domains (Shapka & Keating, 2003). The reasoning goes that, in single-sex classrooms, girls can develop self-confidence in mathematics and science; that is, single-sex classrooms are empowering to girls (hence the term "girl power"). This view is consistent with social psychologists' emphasis

on the crucial importance of social context and social interaction in influencing students' behavior (Rudman & Glick, 2008)

Thus, it could be said that since female students in an academically promoting environment are likely to agree more to questions from LFAIS such as "A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man", "Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States" and "Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history", as compared to women in environments less "supportive of girls' academic achievements in counter stereotypic domains".

**Hypothesis 2a.**This hypothesis predicted that female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger positions on liberal perspective of feminism than students in co-educational higher learning institutions. This hypothesis was unsupported, as no significant differences were found in the liberal subscales scores of single-sex and coed students. Liberal feminism is an individualistic form of feminist theory, which focuses on women's ability to maintain their equality through their own actions and choices. Thus, liberal feminism is about a holistic gender equality, which the contemporary world despite its patriarchy advertises through all kinds of women support interventions supported by United Nations and other philanthropic organisations. This implies that the majority of people, regardless of their educational environment, will render support to this feminism perspective. Hence, it could be said that students from both single-sex and coed environments are almost equally likely to agree with FPS Liberal subscale questions such as "The government is responsible for making sure that all women receive an equal chance at education and employment", "The availability of adequate child care is central to a woman's right to work outside the home", " Men need to be liberated from oppressive sex role stereotypes as much as women do", and "Legislation is the best means to ensure a woman's choice of whether or not to have an abortion".

**Hypothesis 2b.**This hypothesis predicted that **f**emale students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger positions on radical perspective of feminism than students in co-educational higher learning institutions. Based on a highly significant difference between positions on radical perspectives between female students in single-sex and coed students, hypothesis 2b was supported. Thus, single-sex students show a greater position on radical feminism than coed students. Radical feminists perceive themselves as revolutionaries rather than reformers. Thus, it could be said that female students in single-sex institutions find a more conducive environment to have a mobilised 'revolutionary' movement, or to even hold ideologies promoting the same. Students in a coed environment could be said to approach issues of feminism in a more pacific way that promotes co-existence, as opposed to radical measures for dealing with sexism.

This is linked to the ideology of third-wave feminism, which asserts that there needed to be further changes in stereotypes, media portrayals, and language to define women. Third-wave ideology focuses on a more post-structuralist interpretation of gender and sexuality. Thus, while language has been used to create binaries (such as male/female), post-structuralists see these binaries as artificial constructs created to maintain the power of dominant groups.

The items of the FPS radical subscale such as "Using "man" to mean both men and women is one of many ways sexist language destroys women's existence", "Pornography exploits female sexuality and degrades all women", "The workplace is organized around men's physical, economic, and sexual oppression of women", "Men use abortion laws and reproductive technology to control women's lives", and "Romantic love brainwashes women and forms the basis for their subordination" which are more extreme in feminist nature than liberal subscale, attract stronger agreement from the 'revolutionary' third-wave feminists than 'pacific' liberal feminists.

**Hypothesis 2c.**This hypothesis predicted that female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger positions on socialist perspective of feminism than students in co-educational higher learning institutions. This hypothesis was unsupported, with no significant differences between the scores of single-sex and coed students. Socialist feminists reject radical feminism's main claim that patriarchy is the only or primary source of oppression of women. They hold that women should be permitted, respected and valued for all types of work within traditionally male as well as female fields, and adequately compensated for such work. As mentioned above in the case of radical perspective, it could be said the these are the 'pacific' reform ideas that students of coed institutions would abide by, since socialist ideas do not put all the blame on men, but recount numerous other factors for oppression (such as capitalism, etc). It could be assumed that the female students from single-sex institutions would be in agreement with all kinds of feminist actions, as long as it is in women's favour. Therefore, both the samples are likely to agree similarly with FPS Socialist subscale statements such as "A socialist restructuring of businesses and institutions is necessary for women and people of color to assume equal leadership with White men", "The way to eliminate prostitution is to make women economically equal to men", "Capitalism hinders a poor woman's choice to obtain adequate prenatal medical care or an abortion", and " The personalities and behaviors of "women" and "men" in our society have developed to fit the needs of advanced capitalism".

**Hypothesis 2d.**This hypothesis predicted that female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger positions on womanist perspective of feminism than students in co-educational higher learning institutions. This hypothesis was not supported, as no significant differences were found in the scores of single-sex female students and coed students. At its broadest definition, womanist is a universalist ideology for all women, regardless of color. A womanist is committed to "the survival and wholeness of an entire people, male and female".

Racial prejudice is an issue that could be said to hold equal reverence for students from all kinds of educational institutions. Hence, similarity in scores on this subscale could be attributed to the universality of racial struggle, for both men and women.

**Hypothesis 3a.**This hypothesis predicted that students in chronic and discontinuous single-sex schooling show stronger support for feminism than students with chronic coed schooling. This hypothesis was supported, with highly significant differences between scores of chronic and discontinuous single-sex students and chronic coed students. This shows that students who have been exposed to a single-sex schooling environment even for a short period of time in their educational experience tend to show stronger support for feminism than students who have always been in a coeducational schooling environment.

Moreover, in another series of tests, it was found that there is an even higher significant difference between support for feminism in discontinuous single-sex students and chronic coed students. This can again be explained by the assumption that single-sex colleges promote feminist ideologies. Consequently, when girls move on from a coed school (or change schools often before college) to move to a single-sex college (which is the definition of discontinuous single-sex), they tend to show a much higher support for feminism than students who move to a coed college from a coed school, and girls who move from a single-sex school to a single-sex college.

This could be explained by the fact that while chronic single-sex students have been in a single-sex (and hence, as studies say, academically promoting) environment all their lives, discontinuous single-sex students who move on to single-sex institutions where they probably experience this environment for the first time tend to develop an affinity towards it, and a sense of self-created empowerment. Thus, they could be said to show greater support for feminism than students in any other schooling arrangement.

ANOVA tests on all four groups of schooling arrangements revealed that individually, there was a significant difference only between the scores of discontinuous single-sex and chronic coed students. This could be explained by the fact that, in a wider sense, discontinuous single-sex denotes a major change in schooling environment from coed to single-sex, while chronic coed denotes a constant maintenance of environment where that change does not happen. This change is what could be held responsible for the great disparity in scores, and hence, the single-sex environment on the whole.

Women's colleges do offer women's studies programs and feature lots of politically active students, not to mention as extensive an array of other majors and student groups as most mixed-sex colleges. Alumnae of these colleges say that their experiences gave them a singular benefit: learning and living among a select group of intelligent, ambitious women (Brown, 2009).

**Hypothesis 3b.** This hypothesis predicted that students in chronic single-sex schooling have higher feminist self-identification than students in discontinuous coed. This hypothesis was supported, with extremely significant differences between feminist self-identification scores of chronic single-sex and discontinuous coed students. Thus, students with chronic single-sex schooling show much higher feminist self-identification than students with discontinuous coed schooling.

This is very relevant to the assumption of single-sex institution sponsored feminism. The two samples chosen are directly linked: While chronic single-sex represents no change in schooling arrangement when moving from single-sex school to college, discontinuous coed in a wider sense represents a change from single-sex schooling to move to a coed college. The fact that feminist self-identification is greater in the former case is truly indicative of the liberty that single-sex colleges offer in terms of feminist identification. Coed colleges, on the other hand, can be said to house certain barriers to free feminist self-identification, like fear of antagonising the male friends or perceiving the term 'feminism' as too extremist to yield a pacific solution. It is also worth noting that while students who continue in the single-sex environment show high self-identification, students who move from single-sex schools to a coed college might see the college environment as a diversity relief (as against the single-sex school environment) and might come to favour the mixed environment. This might ultimately lead to their de-incentivisation towards women rights, and might lead them to be disinterested in any kind of activity that includes only women.

This can also be linked to the ideology of post-feminism, which holds that the basic goals of equality have been achieved, and relays focus on smaller issues of gender equality with men. Thus, students who move from a single-sex to coed environment might come to feel at par with men both in terms of academics and opportunities, and might be led to believe that the basic gender equality that feminism aims to achieve has been obtained. This could be another important reason for the differences in feminist self-identification.

**Hypothesis 4.** This hypothesis predicted that students in single-sex institutions show higher degree of feminist self-identification than students in co-educational institutions. This hypothesis was supported, with significant differences in the feminist self-identification scores of single-sex and coed students. Thus, in general, students in single-sex higher learning institutions show higher degree of feminist self-identification than students in coed higher learning institutions. Cooperstock (2010) listed life experiences such as education, and perception of feminism amongst factors affecting feminist self-identification. It could be said that while single-sex institutions give women the liberty to follow their way of living, students (especially girls) in coed institutions exhibit a tendency to fit in. This leads to a support for feminism ideals on the one hand, and a need to fit in and be seen as non-threatening on the other. Bro culture is one such

gendered double standard apparent on campuses across the country. "Bro culture"(also known as "frat culture") is basically defined by excessive drinking and its effect on campus culture is pervasive. While excessive drinking has long been a stereotypical cornerstone of the college experience, bro culture extends beyond mere social standards and represents a version of "equality" that ultimately just reinforces sexism: Collegiate women are now expected to be both feminine and sexually attractive, as well as "one of the guys" who can drink and party as much as their male friends can. As U.S. News and World Report noted, binge drinking may have increased among women not because they have a gender-based alcohol problem, but because they are likely consuming drinks one for one with their male friends. But in doing so, because female hormonal and metabolic differences decrease our tolerance for alcohol compared to men, women meet the standard of binge drinking far before their male counterparts. As a result, female college students now outpace men in binge drinking on college campuses (female college students drink 40% more than they did in 1979, numbers for men didn't change). Conforming to male social standards is seen by many college women as a better alternative to submitting to rigid female gender roles (Zeilinger, n.d.; Koebler, 2013).

Thus, in other words, it could be said that instead of creating an identity for women and fighting against loss of that identity, coed environments might lead female students to conform to the male student identities as a way of social and gender acceptance.

Another relevant factor in feminist self-identification is the perception of feminism. According to the previously mentioned Hercampus.com study on feminist self-identification, women in college often make the mistake of saying they are for gender equality but not for feminism. Overall, 97.5 percent of women in the survey said they believe in gender equality, and among college women who do not identify as feminist, 56.6 percent say they believe in equality of the sexes, but not the principles of feminism (Cueto, 2015) This misconception of feminism could be an important factor in determining feminist self-identification in college students.

This study has general limitations of a survey such as limited sampling and respondent availability, possible cooperation problems, inattentiveness, non-response, wariness, respondents cannot be probed due to absence of the interviewer, etc. Surveys with closed-ended questions may have a lower validity rate than other question types. Also, the sample was not equally distributed between males and females.

The study aims to shed light on the role of educational institutions in sponsoring and promoting feminist ideologies in students. Educational environments being the so-called 'second home' of students, it is important to pay heed to the ideologies these environments build and promote, and whether or not they are conducive to positive growth in children. The study, thus, has implications for future research in determining correlates of feminist ideologies in college students. The study also holds relevance and influence for public policymakers in education

while deciding upon establishment of new schools and colleges. Finally, the study also holds relevance for current educational institutions and their administration, and helps them in perception of their own students.

## CONCLUSION

In summary, the focus of this study was on whether the difference in educational structure (coeducational / single-sex) has an impact on the extent to which the students support feminism and the degree of their feminist self-identification. On the basis of statistical measures used in the study, the findings revealed that : 1)Female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger support for feminism than students in coed higher learning institutions; 2)Female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show stronger positions on radical perspective of feminism than students in coed higher learning institutions; 3)Female students in single-sex higher learning institutions show higher feminist self-identification than students in coed higher learning institutions; 4)Students in chronic and discontinuous single-sex schooling show stronger support for feminism than students with chronic coed schooling, 5)Students in chronic single-sex schooling have higher feminist self-identification than students in discontinuous coed. The study has implications for future research on correlates of feminist ideologies in college students as well as in framing public policies on education with respect to single-sex and coed institutions.

## REFERENCES

Albrechtsen, J. (2015). Modern feminism is silent on the real issue of freedom for women. Retrieved from
http://www.theaustralian.com.au/opinion/columnists/janet-albrechtsen/modern-feminism-is-silent-on-the-real-issue-of-freedom-for-women/news-story/ca1052878f37b245c564af0aadda73af

Bigler, R. & Eliot, L. (2011). The Feminist Case Against Single-Sex Schools[Blog Post]. Retrieved from
http://www.slate.com/articles/double_x/doublex/2011/10/the_single_sex_school_myth_an_overwhelming_body_of_research_show.2.html

Brown, H.(2009). Why Women's Colleges Are Still Relevant. Retrieved 29 December 2015 from
http://www.forbes.com/2009/08/12/womens-colleges-student-forbes-woman-leadership-graduate.html

Buchanan, I. (2011).Socialist Feminism. A Dictionary of Critical Theory. Retrieved 14 December 2015 from http://www.oxfordreference.com/

Cooperstock, A. (2010). THE F-WORD: Feminist (Non-) Identification among Undergraduate Women. (Bachelor's Thesis, University of Michigan, Michigan, U.S.A.) Retrieved from http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/handle/2027.42/79467/alexcoop.pdf?sequence=1
Crittenden, D.(2007). WHAT OUR MOTHERS DIDN'T TELL US: Why Happiness Eludes the Modern Woman. U.S.A.: Simon & Schuster.

Cueto, E. (2015). College Women Are Feminists, Her Campus Survey Says, Along With Other
Encouraging Findings [Article]. Retrieved 29 December 2015 from
http://www.bustle.com/articles/92940-college-women-are-feminists-her-campus-survey-
says-along-with-other-encouraging-findings

Henley, N. M., Meng, K., O'Brien, D., McCarthy, W. J., & Sockloslde, R. J. (1998).Measuring
the diversity of feminist attitudes. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22, 317-348.

Hewitt, N.(2010). No Permanent Waves: Recasting Histories of U.S. Feminism. New Brunswick
: Rutgers University Press.

Hilton, P.(2012). America's 8 "Most Feminist Colleges" Revealed [Article]. Retrieved 29
December 2015 from http://totalsororitymove.com/americas-8-most-feminist-colleges-
revealed/

History and Theory of Feminism.(n.d.). Retrieved 25 December 2015 from
http://www.gender.cawater-info.net/knowledge_base/rubricator/feminism_e.htm

Hogan, L. (1995).From Women's Experience to Feminist Theology. Sheffield, England:
Sheffield Academic Press Ltd.

Hooks, B.(1984). "Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center" Cambridge, MA: South End Press

Jackson, C. & Ivinson, G. (2013). Single-sex and co-educational schooling. Gender   and
Education Association. Retrieved from
http://www.genderandeducation.com/resources/pedagogies/singlesex-coeducation/

John, M. E. (1998). Feminism, Internationalism and the West: Questions from the Indian
Context. Occasional Paper No. 27. New Delhi: Centre for Women's Development
Studies. Retrieved from
http://www.cwds.ac.in/ocpaper/feminisminternationalismmaryjohn.pdf

Kanazawa,S. (2009). Why Modern Feminism Is Illogical, Unnecessary, and Evil [Blog Post].The
Scientific Fundamentalist. Retrieved from https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/the-
scientific-fundamentalist/200908/why-modern-feminism-is-illogical-unnecessary-and-
evil

Koebler, J.(2013). Study: College Women Binge Drink More Often Than Men. Retrieved 29
December 2015 from http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2013/05/17/study-college-
women-binge-drink-more-often-than-men

Lamb, S.(2009).Feminist Ideals for a Healthy Female Adolescent Sexuality: A Critique. Sex
Roles,62: 294–306. DOI:10.1007/s11199-009-9698-1

Morgan, B. L. (1996). Putting the feminism into feminism scales: Introduction of a liberal
feminist attitude and ideology scale (LFAIS).Sex Roles, 34, 359–390.

Ngwainmbi, J. (2004). Feminism, Feminist Scholarship, and Social Integration of Women: The
Struggle for African-American Women. Journal of International Women's Studies, 5(5),
93-104. Retrieved from
http://vc.bridgew.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1555&context=jiws

Pahlke, E., Hyde, J. S., & Allison, C. M. (2014). The effects of single-sex compared with coeducational schooling on students' performance and attitudes: A meta-analysis. Psychological bulletin, 140(4), 1042-1072.

Pappu, R.(2001). "A Question of Identity" Seminar, Issue 505. New Delhi. Retrieved December 17, 2012, from http://www.undp.org/content/dam/india/docs/question_identity.pdf

Smith, K. (2007).Assess the Impact of Feminist Thought on Contemporary Politics (Dissertation, The Aberystwyth University, Aberystwyth, Wales, United Kingdom) Retrieved from http://www.e-ir.info/2007/12/22/assess-the-impact-of-feminist-thought-on-contemporary-politics/

Swanson, E. (2013). Poll: Few Identify As Feminists, But Most Believe In Equality Of Sexes. The Huffington Post. Retrieved 29 December 2015 from
http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/04/16/feminism-poll_n_3094917.html

The Basics of Socialist Feminism.(n.d.). Retrieved 25 December 2015 from
http://www.feministezine.com/feminist/modern/THE-BASICS-OF-SOCIALIST-FEMINISM.html

Tong, R.(1989). Feminist Thought: A Comprehensive Introduction (Third ed.). Oxon, United Kingdom: Unwin Human Ltd.

Zeilinger, J. (n.d.). The 3 Biggest Feminist Concerns About The College Experience. Retrieved 29 December 2015 from
http://www.feminist.com/resources/artspeech/genwom/college101.html

## APPENDIX A
## SURVEY ON FEMINISM ITEMS, ARRANGED BY SUBSCALE

**Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale (LFAIS)**

5. Women should be considered as seriously as men as candidates for the Presidency of the United States.

6. Although women can be good leaders, men make better leaders.

7. A woman should have the same job opportunities as a man.

8. Men should respect women more than they currently do.

9. Many women in the work force are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more.

10. Doctors need to take women's health concerns more seriously.

11. America should pass the Equal Rights Amendment.

12. Women have been treated unfairly on the basis of their gender throughout most of human history.

13. Women are already given equal opportunities with men in all important sectors of their lives.

14. Women in the U.S. are treated as second-class citizens.

15. Women can best overcome discrimination by doing the best that they can at their jobs, not by wasting time with political activity.


**Liberal Feminist Perspective**

16. Whether one chooses a traditional or alternative family form should be a matter of personal choice.

17. People should define their marriage and family roles in ways that make them feel most comfortable.

18. The government is responsible for making sure that all women receive an equal chance at education and employment.

19. The availability of adequate child care is central to a woman's right to work outside the home.

20. Homosexuality is not a moral issue, but rather a question of liberty and freedom of expression.

36. Social change for sexual equality will best come about by acting through federal, state, and local government.

37. Legislation is the best means to ensure a woman's choice of whether or not to have an abortion.

38. Women should try to influence legislation in order to gain the right to make their own decisions and choices.

39. Women should have the freedom to sell their sexual services.

40. Men need to be liberated from oppressive sex role stereotypes as much as women do.

**Radical Feminist Perspective**

21. Using "man" to mean both men and women is one of many ways sexist language destroys women's existence.
22. Pornography exploits female sexuality and degrades all women.
23. Sex role stereotpes are only one symptom of the larger system of patriarchal power, which is the true source of women's subordination.
24. The workplace is organized around men's physical, economic, and sexual oppression of women.
25. Men's control over women forces women to be the primary caretakers of children.
41. Men use abortion laws and reproductive technology to control women's lives.
42. Men prevent women from becoming political leaders through their control of economic and political institutions.
43. Marriage is a perfect example of men's physical, economic, and sexual oppression of women.
44. Romantic love brainwashes women and forms the basis for their subordination.
45. Rape is ultimately a powerful tool that keeps women in their place, subsenient to and terrorized by men.


**Socialist Feminist Perspective**

26. Capitalism and sexism are primarily responsible for the increased divorce rate and general breakdown of families.
27. Making women economically dependent on men is capitalism's subtle way of encouraging heterosexual relationships.
28. A socialist restructuring of businesses and institutions is necessary for women and people of color to assume equal leadership with White men.
29. Romantic love supports capitalism by influencing women to place men's emotional and economic needs first.
30. The way to eliminate prostitution is to make women economically equal to men.
46. Capitalism hinders a poor woman's chance to obtain adequate prenatal medical care or an abortion.
47. It is the capitalist system which forces women to be responsible for child care.
48. All religion is like a drug to people and is used to pacify women and other oppressed groups.
49. Capitalism forces most women to wear feminine clothes to keep a job.
50. The personalities and behaviors of "women" and "men" in our society have developed to fit the needs of advanced capitalism.


**Women of Color Perspective**

31. In education and legislation to stop rape, ethnicity and race must be treated sensitively to ensure that women of color are protected equally.

32. Racism and sexism make double the oppression for women of color in the work environment.

33. Women of color have less legal and social service protection from being battered than White women have.

34. Women of color are oppressed by White standards of beauty.

35. Being put on a pedestal, which White women have protested, is a luxury that women of color have not had.

51. Antigay and racist prejudice act together to make it more difficult for gay male and lesbian people of color to maintain relationships.

52. In rape programs and workshops, not enough attention has been given to the special needs of women of color.

53. Discrimination in the workplace is worse for women of color than for all men and White women.

54. Much of the talk about power for women overlooks the need to empower people of all races and colors first.

55. The tradition of Afro-American women who are strong family leaders has strengthened the Afro-American community as a whole.

## Question on Feminist self-identification

56. To what extent do you consider yourself a feminist?

Select only ONE option

- ❏ A committed feminist currently active in the women's movement
- ❏ A committed feminist
- ❏ Feminist
- ❏ I agree with all of the objectives of the feminist movement, but do not consider myself a feminist
- ❏ I agree with most of the objectives of the feminist movement, but do not consider myself a feminist
- ❏ I agree with some of the objectives of the feminist movement, but tend to be somewhat traditional
- ❏ I do not consider myself a feminist at all. I am quite traditional
- ❏ I do not consider myself to be a feminist at all and I believe that feminists are harmful to family life and undermine relations between men and women

# The International Journal of INDIAN PSYCHOLOGY

## Submission open for Volume 3, 2016

The International Journal of Indian Psychology is proud to accept proposals for our 2013 to 2015 Issues. We hope you will be able to join us. For more information, visit our official site: www.ijip.in

**Submit your Paper to,**
At via site: http://ijip.in/index.php/submit-paper.html OR Email: info.ijip@gmail.com

**Topics:**
All areas related to Psychological research fields are covered under IJIP.

**Benefits to Authors:**
• Easy & Rapid Paper publication Process
• IJIP provides "Hard copy of full Paper" to Author, in case author's requirement.
• IJIP provides individual Soft Copy of "Certificate of Publication" to each Author of paper.
• Full Color soft Copy of paper with Journal Cover Pages for Printing
• Paper will publish online as well as in Hard copy of journal.
• Open Access Journal Database for High visibility and promotion of your research work.
• Inclusions in all Major Bibliographic open Journal Databases like Google Scholar.
• A global list of prestigious academic journal reviewers including from WHO, University of Leipzing, University Berlin, University Hamburg, Sardar Patel University & other leading colleges & universities, networked through RED'SHINE Publication. Inc.
• Access to Featured rich IJIP Author Account (Lifetime)

**Formal Conditions of Acceptance:**
• Papers will only be published in English.
• All papers are refereed, and the Editor reserves the right to refuse any manuscript, whether on invitation or otherwise, and to make suggestions and/or modifications before publication.

**Publication Fees:**
₹500/- OR $ 15 USD for Online and Print Publication (All authors' certificates are involved)
₹299/- per Hardcopy (Size A4 with standard Biding)

## Use Our New Helpline Number: 0 76988 26988

Available on

Google Scholar   INTERNET ARCHIVE   Google Books   Available on iTunes   GET IT ON Google Play